Last Updated: Jan 2022 O0097-MPM-JMV Doc #: 24 Filed: 10 08/24 1 of 5 Page Print Form Reset Form

FORM 1 (ND/SD MISS. JAN 2022)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI OXFORD DIVISION

Alex Marcum				PLAINTIFF
v. Lincoln Steven Lewis Oscar Phillips Jennifer Key Marshall County, Mississip	pi	Civil Action No. 3:24-cv-	N 97-MPM-JMV	DEFENDANTS
	CASE MAN	NAGEMENT ORDI	E R	
This Order, including all dead modified only by order of the materials, or reference to port	Court on a showing	1 1	•	
It is hereby Ordered:				
1. ESTIMATED DAYS OF	ΓRIAL:	3		
ESTIMATED TOTAL NU	JMBER OF WITNESSE	s: <u>8</u>		
Expert Testimony Enter explanation (if r		NO. OF EXPERTS:	1-2	
2. ALTERNATIVE DISPUTATIVE dispute res	_	PR]. (Pick one) ppear helpful and will be	e used in this civ	il action as follows:
A settlement conference	e with the Court will	l be set as needed.		

3. CONSENT TO TRIAL BY UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE. (Pick one)

The parties do not consent to trial by a United States Magistrate Judge.

fact witness depositions per party without additional approval of the Court.

FORM 1 (ND/SD MISS. JAN 2022)

E. The parties have complied with the requirements of Local Rule 26(f)(2)(B) regarding discovery of electronically stored information and have concluded as follows:

To identify and preserve any potential ESI, counsel for the parties have alerted or will alert their clients to ensure proper protections are in place to prevent deletions of documents potentially relevant to this litigation, to notify those persons in relevant positions to refrain from destroying ESI that may be relevant to the claims in this litigation and to ensure that no inadvertent deletion of ESI occurs. For any relevant documentation, the parties will produce such communication via hard copy. The parties do not anticipate requesting any discoverable ESI with embedded data and/or metadata. For any ESI discovered during the course of this litigation, however, the parties have agreed to produce paper copies of any electronically stored documents that are produced in response to document requests. The parties are not aware of any discoverable ESI that is not reasonably accessible at this time. In the event any privileged information is inadvertently disclosed via any ESI, the parties have agreed that the privilege is not waived.

F.	The court imposes the following further discovery provisions or limitations:
	1. The parties have agreed that defendant may obtain a Fed.R.Civ. P. 35 (L.U.Civ.R. 35) medical examination of the plaintiff (within subpoena range of the court) by a physician who has not examined the plaintiff, and that defendant may arrange the examination without further order of the court. The examination must be completed in time to comply with expert designation discovery deadlines.
✓	2. Pursuant to FED.R.EVID. 502(d), the attorney-client privilege and the work-product protections are not waived by any disclosure connected within this litigation pending before this Court. Further, the disclosures are not waived in any other federal or state proceeding.
✓	3. Plaintiff must execute an appropriate, HIPAA-compliant medical authorization.
✓	4. The court desires to avoid the necessity of filing written discovery motions where court participation in an informal discussion of the issue might resolve it, even after the parties have been unsuccessful in a good faith attempt to do so. Consequently, before a party may serve any discovery motion, counsel must first confer in good faith as required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(1). If the attorney conference does not resolve the dispute, counsel must contact the chambers of the magistrate judge to request a telephonic conference to discuss the issue as contemplated by Fed. R. Civ. P.16(b)(3)(B)(v). Only if the telephonic conference with the judge is unsuccessful in resolving the issue may a party file a discovery motion.
	5. Other:

FORM 1 (ND/SD M	iiss. JAN	(2022)
----------	---------	-----------	--------

7.

Sc	HEDULING DEADLINES					
A.	Trial. This action is set for JURY TRIAL	RESET DURATION				
	beginning on: January 20, 2026 , at 9:40 , a.m. , in Oxford ,					
	Mississippi, before United States <u>District</u> Judge <u>Michael M. Mills</u> .					
	THE ESTIMATED NUMBER OF DAYS FOR TRIAL IS3 ANY CONFLICTS WITH THIS TRIAL DATE MUST BE SUBMITTED IN WRITING TO THE TRIAL JUDGE IMMEDIATELY UPON RECEIPT OF THIS CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER.					
В.	B. Pretrial. The pretrial conference is set on: December 18, 2025 , at 10:00 , a.m. , in Greenville , Mississippi, before United States Magistrate Judge Jane M. Virden .					
C.	C. Discovery. All discovery must be completed by: June 17, 2025					
D.	D. Amendments. Motions for joinder of parties or amendments to the pleadings must be					
	filed by: January 21, 2025					
E.	Experts. The parties' experts must be designated by the following dates:					
	1. Plaintiff(s): March 21, 2025					
	2. Defendant(s): April 21, 2025					

October 8, 2024

DATE

/s/ Jane M. Virden

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

SO ORDERED: